

Dear FCC,

I have been following with interest the proposed purchase of Rural Cellular (a.k.a. Unicel) by Verizon Wireless. I heartily endorse Senator Sanders' efforts to make this deal contingent on an enforceable commitment to universal cell phone coverage in Vermont. My worry is that the Verizon-Unicel deal would be a step backwards for Vermont.

Instead of phasing out phones that use the GSM-network (such as Unicel), Verizon should adopt the GSM network. That way, more (not fewer) Verizon Wireless customers would get service in this area.

Example: As a Verizon Wireless customer of four years' standing, I get no cell phone signal in the Underhill, Jericho, Jeffersonville area. (This area has no CDMA towers, the only kind used by Verizon. The company does not indicate it plans to build any CDMA towers in this vicinity, either). Yet this area apparently has plenty of GSM towers (the kind used by Unicel): When I am in the presence of Unicel wireless customers, they are always able to send and receive calls, even from the hillsides of Mt. Mansfield! (Not that I would want to. But it's possible.)

As a Vermont resident, I'm always frustrated and resentful when an out-of-state visitor is able to use their cell phone, yet I am not. With the proposed merger, neither Verizon nor Unicel customers will be able to send or receive cell phone calls in this vicinity. That's not progress, and it's certainly not in the best interest of Vermont consumers or businesses.

I use my cell phone for specific purposes, not just to pass the time of day. Year in and year out, I keep hoping that wireless service will improve. The proposed deal decreases my hopes.

-----=_NextPart_000_0034_01C82AC7.1F37D3B0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="us-ascii"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<html xmlns:v=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:vml"
xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office"
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word"
xmlns:m=3D"http://schemas.microsoft.com/office/2004/12/omml"
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">
```

```
<head>
```

```
<meta http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html;
charset=3Dus-ascii">
```

```
<meta name=3DGenerator content=3D"Microsoft Word 12 (filtered medium)">
```

```
<style>
```

```
<!--
```

```
/* Font Definitions */
```

```
@font-face
```

```
{font-family:"Cambria Math";
panose-1:2 4 5 3 5 4 6 3 2 4;}
```

```
@font-face
```

```
{font-family:Calibri;
panose-1:2 15 5 2 2 2 4 3 2 4;}
```

```
/* Style Definitions */
```

```
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
```

```
{margin:0in;
```

```
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
```

```
font-size:11.0pt;
```

```
font-family:"Calibri","sans-serif";}
```

```
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
```

```
{mso-style-priority:99;
```

```
color:blue;
```

```
text-decoration:underline;}
```

```
a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
```

```
{mso-style-priority:99;
color:purple;
text-decoration:underline;}
span.EmailStyle17
{mso-style-type:personal-compose;
font-family:"Calibri","sans-serif";
color:windowtext;}
.MsoChpDefault
{mso-style-type:export-only;}
@page Section1
{size:8.5in 11.0in;
margin:1.0in 1.0in 1.0in 1.0in;}
div.Section1
{page:Section1;}
-->
</style>
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
<o:shapedefaults v:ext=3D"edit" spidmax=3D"1026" />
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
<o:shapelayout v:ext=3D"edit">
<o:idmap v:ext=3D"edit" data=3D"1" />
</o:shapelayout></xml><![endif]-->
</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US link=3Dblue vlink=3Dpurple>

<div class=3DSection1>

<p class=3DMsoNormal
style=3D'mso-margin-top-alt:auto;mso-margin-bottom-alt:auto'><span
style=3D'font-size:9.0pt;font-family:"Arial","sans-serif";color:black'>EC
FS -
Email Filing<br>
&lt;PROCEEDING&gt;&nbsp; 07-208 <br>
&lt;DATE&gt; 11/19/07<br>
&lt;NAME&gt; Sharon Faelten<br>
&lt;ADDRESS1&gt; 19 Sugar Hill Road<br>
<br>
&lt;CITY&gt; Underhill<br>
```

<STATE> VT

<ZIP> 05489-9397

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO <o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal style=3D'mso-margin-top-alt:auto;mso-margin-bottom-alt:auto'><PHONE-NUMBER>

<DESCRIPTION> Email Comment

<CONTACT-EMAIL> netleaf@verizon.net

<TEXT> Dear FCC,<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>I have been following with interest the proposed purchase of Rural Cellular (a.k.a. Unicel) by Verizon Wireless. I heartily endorse Senator Sanders's efforts to make this deal contingent on an enforceable commitment to universal cell phone coverage in Vermont. My worry is that the Verizon's Unicel deal would be a step backwards for Vermont.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><o:p> </o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>Instead of <u>phasing out</u> phones that use the GSM-network (such as Unicel), Verizon should <u>adopt</u> the GSM network. That way, more (not fewer) Verizon Wireless customers would get service in this area.<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><o:p> </o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal>Example: As a Verizon Wireless customer of four years's standing, I get no cell phone signal in the Underhill, Jericho, Jeffersonville

area. (This area has no CDMA towers, the only kind used by Verizon. The company does not indicate it plans to build any CDMA towers in this vicinity, either). Yet this area apparently has plenty of GSM towers (the kind used by Unice1): When I am in the presence of Unice1 wireless customers, they are always able to send and receive calls, even from the hillsides of Mt. Mansfield! (Not that I would want to. But it's possible.)

As a Vermont resident, I'm always frustrated and resentful when an out-of-state visitor is able to use their cell phone, yet I am not. With the proposed merger, neither Verizon nor Unice1 customers will be able to send or receive cell phone calls in this vicinity. That's not progress, and it's certainly not in the best interest of Vermont consumers or businesses.

I use my cell phone for specific purposes, not just to pass the time of day. Year in and year out, I keep hoping that wireless service will improve. The proposed deal decreases my hopes.

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----=_NextPart_000_0034_01C82AC7.1F37D3B0--